

A

# LETTER

TO

Mr. *PHILLIPS.*

Л Е Т Т Е Р

О Т

М И Л Д И Н Г .

A

# LETTER

TO

~~491.c.19~~  
~~to~~

## Mr. PHILLIPS,

Containing some

### OBSERVATIONS

ON HIS

### History of the Life of Reginald Pole.

By RICHARD TILLARD, M. A.

K.

Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. MAT. xv. 9.

*Melius, pejus, profit, obfit, nil vident, nisi quod lubent.*

TER.

L O N D O N:

Printed for the AUTHOR; and sold by R. HORSFIELD, in Ludgate-Street.

[Price ONE SHILLING.]

Tho. Birch Sept. 4.  
1760

Y E T E

ERRATUM.

In Page 27, Line 12, read, *of the Age of  
Fourteen.*



AD O N I D O N

BRITAN NICVM

BY ONE SHIRLING



# Я З Т Т Е Й

## Е Р Р А Т А .

In Page 20, Line 18, for æquiparanter, read æquiparantur.

P. 21, l. 27, for Richard III. r. Richard II.

P. 27, l. 12, r. of the Age of Fourteen.

P. 43, l. 9, for former, r. latter.

P. 59, l. 18, for gratify, r. beatify.



## LETTER, &amp;c.

SIR,

WHEN I first read your History of the Life of Cardinal *Pole*, I could not help thinking you extremely impolitic in publishing an Apology for the *Romish* Religion, (which appears to me to have been the principal Point you had in View) in an Age which seems disposed to take up no Tenets whatsoever upon Trust, but to examine, with the utmost Strictness, whatever Doctrines are proposed to it; nay, even to doubt of what few of Mankind, in any Age of the World before the present, have ever once thought of disputing: Our Senses have been proved nothing but Liars, and the material World has been annihilated by one ingenious Author \*; and another, still more refined, has attempted to demonstrate that we have no more Reason to believe the Existence of Spirit than of Matter, and has left us no

A

thing

\* *Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne.*

thing but a Set of floating Ideas †. Now, Sir, in an Age like this, it is astonishing to me that you should flatter yourself with the least Hopes that Men should be led to embrace a Religion, one of whose first Principles it is, that we must not at all judge for ourselves, but must implicitly follow the Determinations of others. I own I was for some Time at a Loss to discover one probable Motive which might have induced you to this Publication, till at last the two following suggested themselves. The general Gaiety, Dissipation, and Irregularity of the Age we live in, seemed to me one great Encouragement, as I dare say you well know that when Men are resolved not to quit their Vices, but lead a Life of Folly and Irreligion, they are willing to adopt any Scheme which will afford them the easiest Method of being reconciled to an offended Deity, and to this Purpose your Doctrine of Indulgences, and of Masses for the Dead, by Means of which they may be delivered from the Torments of Purgatory, is most excellently adapted: Upon this Principle I think you have acted in a very sensible and judicious Manner. Another Motive, I fear, was the Success your Emissaries have met with, of late Years, in making Converts amongst us, (which has been for some Time past

† *Hume's Treatise on Human Nature.*

past greatly complained of) owing not only to *your* unwearied Diligence and Application, but to the Inattention, Negligence, and Supineness of many of those of our Persuasion, whose Duty it is to instruct the People better. But, however, I hope this open and bold Attack of yours, instead of having the Effect you wish for, of increasing the Number of your Converts, will rouse us from our Letthargy, and make us more diligent to guard our Flocks from your Delusions, and that a much abler Hand will undertake fully and clearly to refute all your Errors. In the mean Time I shall take the Liberty of addressing to you a few Remarks upon your History, which I hope will not prove altogether useless.

The first Thing which I shall take Notice of is your Assertion, "That the whole Christian World beheld, in the Decisions of the Council of *Trent*, a most compleat and accurate Rule of Faith and Discipline, which Error and Licentiousness had endeavoured to overthrow." [p. 3.] Let us examine some few only of the Tenets published under the Authority of this Council, and if they shall be found absurd in themselves, impossible to be believed, and irreconcileable to Scripture, then it's Decisions can no longer

merit the Title you have given them, of being a compleat and accurate Rule of Faith.

The third Canon of the third Sessions of the Council of *Trent* enacts thus, “ To restrain Persons of petulant Dispositions, it is ordained, That no one, depending on his own Wisdom in Matters of Faith or Morals, appertaining to the Edification of Christian Doctrine, shall wrest the sacred Scripture to his own Sense, or contrary to that Sense which our Holy Mother the Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true Sense and Interpretation of Scripture; nor shall even dare to interpret it contrary to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, even though Interpretations of this Sort should never be made public; and whoever acts contrary to this Decree, shall be subject to the Punishment appointed by Law \*.” — Now, Sir, this single Canon, was it the *only* exceptionable one, is sufficient to overthrow the Pretensions of the Decisions of the Council of *Trent* to the Title you have given them; for were the Injunctions of this Canon to be obeyed, and were we implicitly to receive the Interpretation of the Church, the Scriptures would be wholly useless to us, and the Exposition

\* *Summa Conciliorum et Pontificum.* *Lyons, 1587, p. 479. a.*

sition of the Church must be our only Rule of Faith. That this was neither the Intention of the Apostles, nor the Command of our Saviour, but directly contrary to them both, may, I think, be very fairly collected from the two following Texts of Scripture, *Acts xvii. 11*, “These, *viz.* the *Bereans*, “were more noble than those of *Theffalonica*, “in that they received the Word with all “Readiness of Mind, and *searched the Scriptures daily*, whether those Things were so.” Here you find Persons commended for not believing *the Apostles themselves*, till they had searched whether their Doctrine was consonant to Scripture; but if this Authority is not sufficient, I hope that of our blessed **LORD** himself will be admitted as unexceptionable, who appeals to the Scripture for the Proof of his divine Mission, and “commands the *Jews* to *search the Scriptures*, “for in them ye think ye have eternal Life, “and they are they which testify of me,” *John v. 39*. He does not bid them apply to the Doctors of the *Jewiſh* Law, the *Phariſees* their Cardinals, nor the High Priest their Pope, for *their* Interpretation of Scripture, whether he was the *Meffiab* or not, but bids them search the Scriptures *themselves*. This seems to me directly contradictory to the Decree above cited.

The

The next Assertion of this *compleat and accurate Rule of Faith*, which I shall take the Liberty of offering some Observations upon, relates to the Eucharist or Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: The first Canon of the Continuation of the third Session under *Julius III.* Successor to *Paul III.* runs thus: “ In the first Place the sacred Council teaches, and openly and plainly professes, That in the blessed Sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, our *LORD JESUS CHRIST*, very God and Man, truly, really, and substantially is contained under the Form of those visible Things, &c.”\* The third Canon, on the same Subject of the Eucharist, speaks thus: “ The Faith of the Church of God was always the same; that, immediately after Consecration, the very Body and Blood of our *LORD* existed under the Appearance of Bread and Wine, together with his Soul and his Divinity; but that the Body indeed was under the Form of Bread, and the Blood under the Form of Wine, by the Force of the Words; but that the Body was under the Form of the Wine, and the Blood under the Form of the Bread, and the Soul under both, by Virtue of that natural Connection and Concomitancy which

\* *Sum. Consilium et Pont. 507. 6.*

" which unites the several Parts of CHRIST  
 " our LORD, who rose from the Dead, to die  
 " no more: And further, the Divinity is pre-  
 " sent, on Account of its admirable Union  
 " with the Body, and hypostatical Union  
 " with the Soul. Wherefore it is most true,  
 " that as much is contained under either  
 " Form, as under both, for CHRIST, whole  
 " and intire, exists under the Form of the  
 " Bread and every Part of it, and also under  
 " the Form of the Wine and every Part of  
 " that:"

The fourth Canon goes on thus: " But  
 " since CHRIST our Redeemer said, That  
 " what he offered under the Appearance of  
 " Bread, was truly his Body; therefore the  
 " Church of GOD always believed, and this  
 " sacred Synod again declares, That by the  
 " Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there  
 " is a Conversion of the whole Substance of  
 " the Bread, into the Substance of the Body  
 " of CHRIST our LORD, and of the whole  
 " Substance of the Wine, into the Substance  
 " of his Blood; which Conversion, aptly and  
 " properly, is called *Transubstantiation* by the  
 " Holy Catholic Church." \*

I will not affront the Reader's Understanding so much, as to think it necessary to point out the Absurdity and Contradictions of the above Canons, but will just endeavour to shew that there is no Foundation in Scripture for the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. I think the very Words which you bring to prove this Doctrine, will involve you in Difficulties not easily superable. *This is my Body, this is my Blood*; either they must be taken in a literal Sense, or they must not; if the latter is the Case, then at once you give up the Point; if they are to be taken in the literal Sense, upon what Authority do you assert, That the *Soul and Divinity of JESUS CHRIST* are present after the Consecration of the Elements? And farther, where is your Proof that both the Body and Blood are both received under the Form of either Element? For sure, *This is my Body*, taken literally, is not, *This is my Body and Blood*, and so *vice versa*; nor is this all, for, taken in the literal Sense, they as fully prove that our Saviour's Body was given, and his Blood shed, before he was so much as apprehended, much less then was his Body given and his Blood shed; and consequently proving a great deal too much, they prove just nothing at all. As I think, therefore, there is not any Grounds to believe the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, I need take

no Notice of the following Canon, which enjoins the Adoration of the Eucharist; for if one falls to the Ground, the other must of Course sink with it.

As the Conclusion of the sixth Canon of the fourth Session, in regard to Absolution, has something curious and entertaining in it, I cannot help communicating it to the Reader:

" But although the Absolution of the Priest is the Dispensation of a Benefit given by another, yet it is not only a mere Ministrat<sup>ion</sup>, or the good Tidings of announcing or declaring that their Sins are forgiven, but as it were a judicial Act, in which Sentence is pronounced by him as by a Judge; and therefore the Penitent ought not so to sooth himself with his own Faith, if he has not a great deal of Contrition, or there should be wanting in the Priest an Inclination of *acting seriously, or absolving him truly*: He ought not, therefore, to think himself truly and before GOD absolved solely on Account of his own Faith; for neither would Faith without Penitence avail for any Remission of his Sins, and he would be very negligent of his Salvation who should know that the Priest absolved him *in jest*, and should not diligently seek for another acting more seriously."\*

B. **Really,**

\* Sum. Con. et Pont. 523, a, b.

Really, Sir, it is to me astonishing, that a Man of Sense and Ingenuity, as by your Manner of Writing you seem to be, should so prostitute his own Understanding, or endeavour to impose upon that of others, as to recommend the Decisions of the Council of *Trent*, as *a compleat and accurate Rule of Faith*. I should be glad, Sir, if you would answer the following Queries arising from the *very extraordinary Canon* above-cited. Is it customary with the Priests of your Church to *jest* with the Salvation of the People, and with her own Sacraments \*? So says the Council of *Trent*, which we must believe.— Again, Sir, suppose the Man should die immediately after this jesting Priest had left him, and before one of a more serious Turn could be procured, what becomes of the Man, must he be damned? I doubt so, since the same Authority tells us he must not think himself truly, and before GOD absolved. Once more, Sir, supposing the Penitent never arrives at the Knowledge of this Priest's not intending to absolve him *truly*, and sooths himself with the Hopes of being quite safe, and dies in this Persuasion, what must become of him then? What a Situation must he be in to find, when it is too late, that he was absolved only in *Jest*, and not seriously

\* Absolution is considered by the Council of *Trent* as Part of the Sacrament of *Penance*.

and truly? I will produce only one Instance more, out of Numbers which still remain, of the Absurdity of this *most excellent Council*, *viz.* the Decree touching the Invocation of Saints: “The sacred Synod commands all “Bishops and others, who have the Office “and Care of Teaching, that, according to “the Use of the Catholic and Apostolic “Church, received from the earliest Times “of the Christian Religion, the Consent of “holy Fathers, and the Decrees of sacred “Councils, they should in the first Place di- “ligently instruct the Faithful concerning “the Intercession of Saints, the Invocation, “the Honour due to Reliques, and the lawful “Use of Images; teaching them that the “Saints reigning together with CHRIST, of- “fer up their Prayers to GOD for Men; that “it is right and useful humbly to invoke “them, and to have Recourse to their Pray- “ers, Help, and Assistance to obtain Blessings “from GOD through his Son JESUS CHRIST “our LORD, who is our sole Redeemer and “Saviour; and that they hold impious Te- “nets, who deny that the Saints enjoying eter- “nal Happiness in Heaven are to be invoked; “or who assert that they do not pray for “Men, or that the Invocation of them to “pray for us is Idolatry, or is contrary to “the Word of GOD, or derogates from the

“ Honour of the one Mediator between GOD  
“ and Man, CHRIST JESUS. 2 Can. 9 Seſſ. †

The first Objection which I would make to this Canon is, That, if we may believe the Writers of your own Church, this was *not* the Practice and Opinion of the Catholic and Apostolic Church from the earliest Times of the Christian Religion; for *Dupin* tells us, that it was the Opinion of the Fathers of the three first Centuries, “ That the Day of Judgment was at Hand; that the Souls of Men untill that Day were neither perfectly happy nor miserable, though they underwent some Punishment before hand, or were at Rest, according to the Proportion of Good and Evil they had done in their Bodies \*.” Now, Sir, I presume that all your departed Saints were Men, consequently the Opinion of the Church concerning them was, That they would not receive their perfect Consummation of Bliss till the Day of Judgment, therefore they were not yet admitted into Heaven, and on this Account could not, properly speaking, according to the Doctrine delivered in this Canon, make Intercession for us. The second Objection I have to offer against this Canon is, That it is directly contrary to

Scrip-

† Sum. Con. et Pont. 597, a and b.

\* 1st *Dup.* p. 180, Fol. 3d Edit. English. London, 1696.

Scripture. We are there told, "That this  
 " Man, because he continueth for ever, hath  
 " an unchangeable Priesthood, wherefore he  
 " is able to save them to the uttermost that  
 " come unto God by him, seeing he ever  
 " liveth to make Intercession for them.†"  
 Since this is the Case, what need we seek for  
 any further Mediators, when there is one  
 who is able to save us to the uttermost?  
 And St. Paul expressly tells us, "That there  
 " is *one* God and *one* Mediator between God  
 " and Men, the Man CHRIST JESUS.‡"  
 From whence then is your Authority deri-  
 ved for the Multitude of Mediators and In-  
 tercessors which you acknowledge? Why do  
 you invoke them? Why do you pray to  
 them? Why do you give them the Wor-  
 ship which is due to God alone?

As I think, Sir, that the Absurdity and  
 Weakness, as well as the manifest Contradic-  
 tion to Scripture, contained in the Canons  
 of that famous Council, whose Decisions  
 you recommend as *a complete and accurate*  
*Rule of Faith*, has been sufficiently proved, I  
 shall take my Leave of them; only assuring  
 the Reader, that if he has Leisure and In-  
 clination to examine them, he will meet with  
 many others, *equally curious and equally ex-*  
*cellent*

† *Heb. vii. 24, 25.*‡ *1 Tim. ii. 5.*

cellent, and I shall now return to make some farther Observations upon your History.

You tell us then in many Parts of it, and particularly in the 178th Page, " That the Pope's Supremacy had been constantly avowed by the *English* Nation ever since she had received Christianity, thro' a Period of 900 Years ; but that in *Henry the Eighth's* Reign it was become High Treason to acknowledge it, and another Headship, with which *all Antiquity was unacquainted*, set up in it's Stead, and the same Penalty inflicted on those who refused to submit to it, as on Traitors and Falsions."

From this Paragraph, Sir, I should be tempted to imagine that you had never read the History of *England* yourself, or that you thought no one else ever had, or ever could possibly obtain a Sight of it, otherwise, surely, you would never have asserted so confidently what might be so easily confuted, and what is so plainly contradicted in so many Passages of the *English* History.

" At the first Conversion of the *Saxons* to Christianity by the Ministry of *Austin*, sent hither for that Purpose by *Gregory I. Austin* prevailed upon the *British* Bishops to " meet

" meet him in a public Synod; where, as he  
 " was earnestly pressing them to submit to the  
 " Pope, and carrying the Papal Prerogatives  
 " to a great Height, *Dinoth, Abbot of Bæn-*  
 " *gor*, made him this Answer, You propose  
 " to us Obedience to the Church of *Rome*,  
 " are you ignorant that we already owe a De-  
 " ference to the Church of God, to the Bi-  
 " shop of *Rome*, and to all Christians, of  
 " Love and Charity, which obliges us to en-  
 " deavour, by all possible Means, to assist  
 " and do them all the Good we can? *Other*  
 " *Obedience than this, to him you call Pope,*  
 " *we know not of*, and this we are always  
 " ready to pay: But for a *Superior*, what  
 " Need have we to go *so far as Rome*,  
 " when we are govern'd, under God, by the  
 " Bishop of *Caerleon*, who hath Authority  
 " to take Care of our Churches and Spi-  
 " tual Affairs?\*" Here, Sir, is one plain  
 Contradiction of the universal Acknowle-  
 dgment of the Pope's Supremacy; but as some  
 Writers of your Church have pretended that  
 this Speech was forged since the Reforma-  
 tion, I shall produce what I hope you will  
 admit as unquestionable Authority, the Te-  
 stimony of an Author of your own Persuasion,  
 to prove that at this Time the Bishop of *Rome*  
 himself did not lay Claim to this universal

Supremacy;

\* 1st Rap. 68, a, Fol. 2d Edit. London, 1732.

Supremacy; *Dupin*, speaking of St. *Gregory*, at that Time Bishop of *Rome*, says, “ He did often vigorously oppose the Title of Universal Patriarch, which the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* assumed to themselves: †” And *Cave* tells us, that he call’d this Title *proud, heretical, blasphemous, antichristian, and diabolical*; so far were the Bishops of *Rome* at that Time from *claiming* universal Supremacy. But to proceed a little farther in History; the whole Story of *Wilfrid*, Bishop of *York*, and his Disputes with the King, are too long to be inserted here, suffice it therefore to say, he was deprived of his Bishopric, appealed to *Rome*, went there to prosecute his Appeal; the Cause was given in his Favour, and a Decree of the Pope issued for his Restoration. With this Mandate he returns to *England*; and what was the Consequence? “ *Egfrid*, King of Northumberland, paid so little Regard to this Decree, that, after he had upbraided the Bishop for procuring it by Bribery, he put him in Prison, where he kept him a whole Year †.” *An admirable Proof of the Pope's acknowledged Supremacy!*

Let us now advance a little further in the English History, and see what was the Situation

† 5th *Dup.* 73.† 1st *Rapin*, p. 75.

tion of Affairs under the *Norman Conqueror*.  
 " He retained the *Church*, says Mr. *Hume*,  
 " in great Subjection, as well as his *Lay Subjects*, and would allow none, of whatever  
 " Character, to dispute his Sovereign Will  
 " and Pleasure. He prohibited his Subjects  
 " to acknowledge any one for Pope, whom  
 " he himself had not previously received.  
 " He required that all Ecclesiastical Canons,  
 " voted in any Synod, should first be laid be-  
 " fore him, and ratified by his Authority ;  
 " even Bulls or Letters from *Rome*, before  
 " they were produced, must receive the same  
 " Sanction ; and none of his Ministers or Ba-  
 " rons, whatever Offences they were guilty  
 " of, must be subjected to Spiritual Censures,  
 " till he himself had given his Consent to  
 " their Excommunication. These Regula-  
 " tions were worthy of a Sovereign, and *kept*  
 " *united the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers* \*."

This, Sir, seems an Authority to which you cannot easily object, as you have more than once, in the Course of your own History, quoted Mr. *Hume* as an impartial Historian; and I am sure, if Words can be express *against* the Pope's Supremacy, and in Favour of the King's, these are so; for you see he would not so much as suffer them to frame Laws for the Government of the Church, and publish

C them,

\* *1st Hume*, 276, Octavo, London, 1763.

them, till they had first received his Sanction. But lest these Facts, though asserted by almost every *English* Historian, should still be deemed insufficient, I shall produce two or three Vouchers for what I have asserted, from the *Statutes*, which cannot be falsified, and which will prove incontestably, that the Supremacy of the Pope was not, as you pretend, constantly avowed by the *English* Nation.

To begin with that Statute which you yourself introduce Cardinal *Pole* as quoting, concerning the Rights of the Church, he tells us, " That in the Grand Charter, which was " the Bond of the mutual Covenant between " Prince and People, and which was the Bafe " of the Liberty and Property of the whole " Body of the People, the Rights and Immu- " nities of the Church were secured by the " very first Article of this Bulwark of our " Constitution; that it had been solemnly " sworn to by all our Kings, and had been " always look'd on as a necessary Condition " to their Inauguration, and as corelative to " the Allegiance paid to their sacred Persons; " that his present Majesty had taken on him " this Engagement in like Manner with his " Predecessors: But tho' the Supremacy of the " See of *Rome* had been constantly avowed " by the *English* Nation, ever since she had  
" receiv'd

“ receiv’d Christianity, thro’ a Period of 900  
 “ Years, it was now become High Treason  
 “ to acknowledge it.” [p. 178.]

From this artful Transition of the Cardinal’s, I think any one would be led to imagine that the Pope’s Supremacy was acknowledged, *totidem Verbis*, in the Grand Charter, or at least that it was fairly and clearly deducible from thence: But let us hear the Charter speaking for itself, and we shall find a different Language in it, and, I think, it will appear plainly to assert the Royal Supremacy. “ *Henry, by the Grace of God, King of England, &c.* To all Archbishops, Bishops, &c. Know ye that we, unto the Honour of *God, Almighty God*, and for the Salvation of the Souls of our Progenitors and Successors, Kings of *England*, to the Advancement of Holy Church, and Amendment of our Realm, *of our meer and free Will* have given and granted to all Archbishops, &c. and to all free Men of our Realm, these Liberties following, to be kept in our Kingdom of *England* for ever. First, we have granted unto *God*, and by this our present Charter have confirmed for us and our Heirs for ever, That the Church of *England* shall be free, and shall have all her

“ whole Rights and Liberties inviolable\*.” Here, Sir, you will be pleased to observe, that every Right the Church enjoys, flows from the King, *of his meer and free Will*; and it seems very strange that she should derive all her Rights and Privileges from a Person who had no Jurisdiction at all over her. And my Lord *Coke*, in his Comment on this first Chapter, That the Church of *England* should be free, says, “ That is, that all Ecclesiastical Persons within the Realm, their Possessions and Goods, shall be freed from all unjust Vexations and Oppressions, but notwithstanding should yield all lawful Duties, either to the King or any of his Subjects; and enjoy their Liberties; that is, says he, only such as of Right they had before, *Jura Ecclesiæ publicis æquiparant*. The Rights of the Church are similar and consonant to the Laws of the Land. Every Arch-bishopric and Bishopric in *England* are of the King’s Foundation, and holden of the King *per Baroniam* ||.” It seems strangely unreasonable that a Founder should have no Jurisdiction over what he establishes. These Liberties are to be held from us and our Heirs for ever. “ In this Place, says my Lord *Coke*, these Words are not inserted to make

“ a

\* Magna Charta Preamb. et Ch. 1. Statutes at large, p. 1. London, 1734.

|| Second Inst. p. 3. London, 1669.

“a legal Tenure of the King, but to intimate that *all* Liberties were at the first derived from the Crown\*.” No Exception here for Ecclesiastical Liberties; from whence I think, Sir, I may very fairly draw this Conclusion, If all Ecclesiastical as well as Civil Liberties were originally derived from the Crown, the Church was dependent upon the Crown, and the Crown was, in our original Constitution, the Head of the Church. But all Ecclesiastical Liberties (as appears from what has been above said) were so derived, therefore the Crown was originally the Head of the Church. But if farther Proof is wanting, the Numbers of Statutes, so frequently enacted against diverse unwarrantable Impositions and Usurpations of the Pope, demonstrate beyond any Possibility of Doubt, that his Supremacy was not acknowledged as you pretend. For Instance; the Statute of the 35th of *Edward I.* *Ch.* 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>d</sup>, and 3<sup>d</sup>, against the Subsidies and Taxes imposed by the Pope on the Clergy, and against their remitting the Sums demanded of them, the 25th of *Edward III.* *Ch.* 22<sup>d</sup>, against purchasing Provisions from *Rome*, to hold Abbies, 13 *Richard III.* *Ch.* 2<sup>d</sup>, and many others too tedious to mention, all manifestly prove the Denial of the Pope’s Supremacy;

\* *Second Inst.* p. 5.

macy ; for it is an absolute Contradiction to acknowledge his Supremacy and deny him the Exercise of his Power. This Point then of the Pope's Supremacy being, I think, clearly proved, contrary to the Custom, the Constitution, and Laws of *England*, let us examine it a little further, and I fancy we shall find as little Foundation for it either in Reason or Scripture : Upon the Foot of Reason, I think, the Arguments which Cardinal *Pole* has furnished us with, and which he attributes to *Cromwell*, are extremely conclusive.

" To whom could the Title of Head  
 " of a Kingdom so properly belong as to the  
 " King ? That two Heads in the same State  
 " are a Prodigy, the *Fiction of Priestcraft*,  
 " to subtract the Clergy from the Jurisdiction  
 " of the Prince. That *Henry*, therefore,  
 " should reinstate himself in what they had  
 " fraudulently usurped, and by this Means  
 " add a new Lustre to the Crown, and be  
 " King in a far more extensive Sense than  
 " his Forefathers ; that no Treason could be  
 " higher or more injurious to his Person and  
 " Prerogative, than to acknowledge his Au-  
 " thority in a foreign Power, he had conse-  
 " quently nothing more to do, but to assert a  
 " Claim inherent to the Royal Dignity, and  
 " thus establish a Reputation superior to the  
 " Kings his Predecessors, and leave a lasting  
 " Mo-

“Monument of his own Wisdom\*.” Whether or no this was *Cromwell’s* Advice to the King, must rest upon the Authority of Cardinal *Pole’s* Apology to the Emperor, for you quote no other for it, and in neither *Hume* nor *Rapin* appear the least Traces of this long Conversation; but supposing it to be so, it was Advice worthy of an able and loyal Minister, one who had the Honour of his King and the Good of his Country at Heart, and which will remain, as long as Reason shall prevail over Absurdity, a lasting Monument of his Wisdom; for can any Thing be imagined more absurd than for one Part of a Monarch’s Subjects to disobey his Commands under Pretence of Obedience to a foreign Power, and by this Means, whenever discontented or displeased by any Measures, to have a Cloak always ready to cover Treason and Rebellion? So monstrous a Power, so contradictory to common Sense, could only be established by the Countenance and Assistance of artful and designing Men, to prevent themselves from being, on any Account, amenable to public Justice. We have seen how contrary to Reason the Pope’s asserted Supremacy appears, and upon Examination, I believe, we shall find it is founded on no Part of Scripture. The only Place which I know of that is ever pretended for it, at least the Text which

which you have chose to support it, is the 19th Verse of the 16th Chapter of St. *Matthew*, where our Saviour says to St. *Peter*, “ That he will give unto him the Keys of “ the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever “ he should bind on Earth, should be bound “ in Heaven, and whatsoever he should loose “ on Earth, should be loosed in Heaven.”

Now, Sir, supposing that it was our Saviour’s Intention by these Words to give St. *Peter* a Supremacy over the other Apostles, yet there is not a single Syllable of this Grant extending to all his Successors: But that our blessed *Lord* had no such Design, appears to me extremely clear from his Decision, when they contested for the Superiority, which was posterior in Point of Time to this Promise made to St. *Peter*, see *Mark* x. 42, 43, 44, and *Luke* xxii. 25, 26. You tell us, Sir, that St. *Peter* presided in the first Council at *Jerusalem*. I have read the whole Chapter you quote as your Authority, *viz.* 15th of the *Acts*, and I find no such Thing in it. After there had been Debates, *Peter* rose up and spoke, and gave his Opinion; and I think the Presumption rather appears stronger in Favour of St. *James* presiding there; for I am sure he speaks with much more Authority, my Sentence is, &c. *Acts* xv. 19, and immediately after the Council closes in with this Sentence, and

and the Dispatches are sent accordingly to the *Gentiles* by *Paul* and *Barnabas*. And it seems something observable too, that this pretended Primacy is no where acknowledged by the Apostles themselves ; nay, so far from it, that St. *Paul* says of himself, “ In nothing am I behind the very chiefest Apostles,” *2 Cor. xii. 11.* And in another Place he tells us, that when *Peter* was come to *Antioch* he withstood him to the Face, because he was to be blamed, *Gal. ii. 11.* A plain Proof this, that he did not look upon him as the Vicar of JESUS CHRIST, to whom he was to pay Obedience in all Things. Having, I hope, sufficiently proved that this Doctrine, which you labour so much to establish, of the Pope’s *constantly avowed* Supremacy, has no Foundation either in History, Reason, or Scripture, I shall now consider some Passages of your History, in regard to the Divorce, to *Anna Boleyn*, &c. And here, Sir, by the Way, give me Leave to observe to you, and wish you would reflect yourself, how strangely Prejudice and Partiality, in Favour of a particular Tenet, has bias’d your Judgment : After having spoke of that Transaction in the most opprobrious Terms, the Conclusion of your Reflections upon it runs thus, “ And that nothing might be wanting to give the Iniquity of the whole Pro-

" ceeding every Aggravation it admitted of,  
 " which *Henry* always took Care should be  
 " the Characteristic of his Transgressions,  
 " the impious Farce of Conscience was  
 " acted, and the Fear of an offended GOD  
 " pretended as the Motive of an Action, in  
 " which *all Laws, Human and Divine, were*  
 " *violated.*" Having said this, you begin your  
 next Paragraph, with telling us, " That the  
 " Scandal of this Event was *quite sunk* in the  
 " immediate Consequence of it, *the renoun-*  
 " *cing the Pope's Supremacy*, and separating  
 " from the Catholic Church." [p. 112.]

Here, Sir, I hope you will excuse me if I  
 say your Zeal has transported you so far as to  
 make you write absolute Nonsense; for it is  
 impossible the Scandal of any Action can be  
 sunk in the Offence given by another, unless  
 the latter is worse; and how any Action can  
 be worse than the Violation of *all Laws, Hu-*  
*man and Divine*, I own I am at a Loss to dis-  
 cover, and shall therefore leave to *you* the ar-  
 duous Task of solving this Difficulty.

To proceed now to *Henry* and the Divorce.  
 Though it is impossible to vindicate *Henry's*  
 Conduct in every Particular, as in many Re-  
 spects he was extremely culpable, yet in this  
 Affair of the Divorce, even if we admit him to  
 be

be in the Wrong, yet it seems by no Means to deserve the infamous Character you have given of it. Historians, in general, agree that his Father, through a Principle of Avarice, had contracted him to the Princess *Catherine*, (the Pope's Dispensation being previously obtained) though at the Time *Warham*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, told him it was contrary to the Law of GOD, which the Pope had no Power to dispense with. In Consequence of this his Father caus'd him, the very Day he was of Age, to enter a formal Protest against the Marriage, and on his Death-Bed charged him never to compleat it. When he came to the Crown, and the Marriage came in Question, whether he should or should not accomplish it, the Archbishop still persisted uniformly in opposing it; but *Fox*, Bishop of *Winchester*, strenuously insisted upon the Pope's Dispensation, and the unlimited Power of CHRIST's Vicar; but this would have been insufficient, had he not subjoin'd other Reasons of State, which induced the King and Council to compleat the Marriage: And tho', as Mr. *Hume* says, " *Henry's* Youth and Dissipation kept him, during some Time, from entertaining any Scruples with regard to the Measures he had embraced, there happened Incidents sufficient to rouse his Attention, and to inform him of the

*of fourteen*

“ Sentiments generally entertained on that Subject \*.” The Emperor, though afterwards he so warmly opposed the Divorce, and espoused the Cause of *Catherine*, yet, by the Advice of the States of *Castile*, had declined to marry the Princess *Mary*; and, among other Objections, the *illegitimate Birth* of the Princess had been insisted on.

Thus, Sir, you see that others entertained Doubts of the Legality of the Marriage, and they too were Persons, the Honour of whose Family was concerned in asserting the Validity of it; and therefore the Prosecution of a Divorce from a Marriage, the Legality of which was doubted by others, as well as the Party concerned, ought not to be branded as a Breach of *all Laws, both Human and Divine*. That the King might pursue this Affair with greater Earnestness, on Account of his Affection for *Ann Boleyn*, is not to be denied; but that it took its Rise from thence is not to be supposed, since almost all the Historians agree that she did not return to *England* till a Twelvemonth after the first moving of the Divorce.

Having thus endeavoured to shew that *Henry* was not so extremely blameable in this Affair

\* 4th *Hume*, 84.

fair as you have represented him, I cannot  
 pass over in Silence your groundless Calum-  
 nies against that unfortunate, injured, and  
 innocent Princess, and her whole Family;  
 for, not satisfied with vilifying her, (as we  
 shall see hereafter) you have inserted (indeed  
 you quote your Cardinal for it) that idle  
 Story of the King's having seduced her Sister,  
 and you say he asserts it as a known Truth;  
 " and had such an Imputation been Slander,  
 " or even of doubtful Report, it would have  
 " been utterly unworthy and inconsistent  
 " with his Character who relates it, and must  
 " have raised the Clamours not only of the  
 " *English*, but of all Foreigners against him"  
 " [p. 61]. Now, Sir, not to mention that  
 this Assertion of *Pole*'s might be known only  
 to the King, to whom you tell us this Tre-  
 atise was sent by one of *Pole*'s Gentlemen, and  
 he had too much Sense to divulge it to the  
 Prejudice of the Queen's Sister, and there-  
 fore neither *English* nor Foreigners could  
 possibly blame him for it: Yet it seems very  
 extraordinary that no Historian of Credit  
 should mention this Circumstance, unless to  
 deny it, as *Burnet* and *Rapin* have both done,  
 and *Hume* has not one single Syllable in Rela-  
 tion to it: It is only to be found in *Pole* and  
*Sanders*; where, to use your own Expressions,  
 " no Circumstance has been overlooked;  
 " where

“ where every Aggravation, which regards  
 “ this Article, is set forth in all its Iniquity,  
 “ and heightened with all the Colouring that  
 “ Indignation and Eloquence can give” [p. 62];  
 or, to speak more properly in Bishop Burnet’s  
 Phrase, with all that Rancour and Malice  
 which take their Rise from Bigotry and blind  
 Zeal. To these Principles must be attributed  
 the Calumnies with which you have loaded  
 the Memory of the Queen herself, for which  
 there is as little Foundation as for many other  
 Things you have thought proper to assert.  
 Not to quote the whole of the Character  
 which you have given her, I shall content  
 myself with taking Notice of what you tell  
 us in regard to her Execution and Confine-  
 ment: “ Her Fate, you say, was considered  
 “ not merely as a Punishment, but as a divine  
 “ Judgment, and the Crowd that throng’d to  
 “ the Place of Execution gazed on her with  
 “ Unconcern, as a Shew they came to be  
 “ Spectators of, but in which they took no  
 “ Part” [p. 124]. Strange this! that in a  
 few Days the Minds of Men should be so  
 changed in regard to her; for Mr. *Hume* tells  
 us, that at her Trial the Spectators could not  
 forbear pronouncing her *entirely* innocent.  
 You tell us too that, during her Confine-  
 ment, “ her broken Speeches and her whole  
 “ Behaviour betrayed a wild and disordered

“ Mind,

“ Mind, and all the Dread of approaching  
 “ Death, without any Sense of the Guilt  
 “ which had occasioned it; and that, when  
 “ she came to the Scaffold, preserving a De-  
 “ cency she had been unmindful of on more  
 “ important Occasions, she drew her Gar-  
 “ ments below her Feet, and received a  
 “ Stroke, which finished a Life of Levity,  
 “ Error, and Lewdness” [p. 125]. For this  
 Account we have the Authority of Mr. *Phil-  
 lips*, and it is erroneous in almost every Par-  
 ticular, as will appear from the Letter wrote  
 by Sir *William Kingston*, Constable of the  
 Tower, to *Cromwell*.

S I R,

**T**HIS shall be to advertise you that I have received your Letter, wherein you would have Strangers conveyed out of the Tower, and so they be, by the Means of Richard Gre-  
 sham, William Loke, and Withepole; but the Number of Strangers past not thirty, and not many hothe (other); and the Ambassador of the Emperor had a Servant there, and ho-  
 nestly put out. Sir, if we have not an Hour certain, as it may be known in London, I think here will be but few; and I think a reasonable Number were best, for I suppose she will de-  
 clare herself to be a good Woman, for all Men but the King, at the Hour of her Death; for this

this Morning she sent for me, that I might be with her at such Time as she received the good Lord, to the Intent that I should hear her speak as touching her Innocency always to be clear. And in the writing of this she sent for me, and at my Coming she said, Mr. Kingston, I bear I shall not die afore Noon, and I am very sorry therefore, for I thought to be dead by this Time, and past my Pain. I told her it should be no Pain, it was so little. And then she said, I heard say the Executioner was very good, and I have a little Neck, and put her Hands about it, laughing heartily. I have seen many Men and also Women executed, and that they have been in great Sorrow, and to my Knowledge this Lady has much Joy and Pleasure in Death. Sir, her Almoner is continually with her, and had been since Two o'Clock after Midnight. This is the Effect of any Thing here at this Time, and thus fare you well. \*

Here we find there was an Order sent from Cromwell to prevent Strangers being admitted into the Tower; in Consequence of which those who had entered, to the Number of thirty, were turned out. Where then is Mr. Phillips's Crowd who throng'd to her Execution? Sir William Kingston tells us that,

the

\* 1st Rapin, 811.

the Morning of her Execution, she sent for him to be present at her receiving the Sacrament, and at that solemn Office to hear her declare her Innocency. How hardened must we suppose her, to imagine that in so solemn a Manner, and under such Circumstances, she would declare a Falshood? He tells us further, That he had seen many Persons executed, who betrayed Concern at their Death; but that she, *to his Knowledge, had much Joy and Pleasure in Death.* No Account here of broken Speeches, of a wild and disordered Mind, and all the Dread of approaching Death; which then shall we credit, Mr. Phillips's Account, taken (as he says) from *Gratiani*, a Romish Bishop, or Sir *William Kingston's*, an Eye-Witness of her whole Conduct? Certainly every sensible and *impartial* Man will believe the latter. With respect to her general Character, her whole Conduct might not be strictly defensible; her Education in the Court of *France* might have given her a Gaiety inconsistent with the Manners of the *English* Nation; but *Rapin, Burnet, Hume*, who mention this Circumstance, all concur in pronouncing her guiltless. *Hume* tells us " the Innocence of this unfortunate Queen " cannot reasonably be called in Question: " *Henry* himself, in the Violence of his Rage, " knew not whom to accuse as her Lover;

“ and though he imputed Guilt to her Brother and four Persons more, he was able to bring Proof against none of them. The whole Tenor of her Conduct forbids us to ascribe to her an abandoned Character, such as is implied in the King’s Accusation; and had she been so lost to all Prudence and Sense of Shame, she must have exposed herself to Detection, and afforded her Enemies the clearest Evidence against her: But the King made the most effectual Apology for her, by marrying *Jane Seymour* the very Day after her Execution.” \*

Before I entirely quit this Subject, as you quote *Sanders* for one of your Authorities against this unfortunate Queen, I cannot help mentioning that his Partiality was so great, or, to speak plainer, his Malice was so inveterate against her, that he has painted her Body as deformed as her Mind; whereas it is notorious to every one that she was generally allowed to have been very handsome: Nor can it possibly be believed that *Henry* would otherwise ever have thought of raising her to his Bed and Throne.

Your Character of *Cromwell* seems equally extraordinary with that you have given us of

\* 4th *Hume*, 176.

of the Queen. You tell us that he was “irrestrained by any Principle, Human or Divine, “ and the brutal Savageness of his Mind being “ equal to his vile Extraction, he was alike “ qualified to plan and execute his Prince’s “ worst Designs” [p. 164]. Now, Sir, as you have quoted no Authority to prove this, you will excuse us if we do not hastily give Credit to it upon your bare Assertion, especially since a most inveterate Hatred appears against him, whenever you have Occasion to mention his Name. If we may believe *Burnet, Rapin, Hume*, he was not the Man you endeavour to represent him; but I shall confine myself to the Authority of Mr. *Hume*, as I believe him wholly unprejudiced in Favour of the religious Tenets of any particular Sect whatever. He, speaking of *Cromwell*, says, “ He was a Man of Prudence, Industry, and “ Ability, worthy of a better Master and a “ better Fate. Tho’ raised to the Summit “ of Power, from a very low Origin, he be- “ trayed no Insolence, or Contempt of his “ Inferiors, and was careful to remember all “ the Obligations which, during his lower “ Fortune, he had owed to any one\*.”— Gratitude and Humility, Sir, surely are no Marks of a brutal Savageness of Temper.

“ and though he imputed Guilt to her Brother and four Persons more, he was able “ to bring Proof against none of them. The “ whole Tenor of her Conduct forbids us to “ ascribe to her an abandoned Character, “ such as is implied in the King’s Accusation ; and had she been so lost to all Prudence and Sense of Shame, she must have “ exposed herself to Detection, and afforded “ her Enemies the clearest Evidence against “ her : But the King made the most effectual “ Apology for her, by marrying *Jane Seymour* the very Day after her Execution.” \*

Before I entirely quit this Subject, as you quote *Sanders* for one of your Authorities against this unfortunate Queen, I cannot help mentioning that his Partiality was so great, or, to speak plainer, his Malice was so inveterate against her, that he has painted her Body as deformed as her Mind ; whereas it is notorious to every one that she was generally allowed to have been very handsome : Nor can it possibly be believed that *Henry* would otherwise ever have thought of raising her to his Bed and Throne.

Your Character of *Cromwell* seems equally extraordinary with that you have given us  
of

of the Queen. You tell us that he was “irrestrained by any Principle, Human or Divine, and the brutal Savageness of his Mind being equal to his vile Extraction, he was alike qualified to plan and execute his Prince’s worst Designs” [p. 164]. Now, Sir, as you have quoted no Authority to prove this, you will excuse us if we do not hastily give Credit to it upon your bare Assertion, especially since a most inveterate Hatred appears against him, whenever you have Occasion to mention his Name. If we may believe *Burnet, Rapin, Hume*, he was not the Man you endeavour to represent him; but I shall confine myself to the Authority of Mr. *Hume*, as I believe him wholly unprejudiced in Favour of the religious Tenets of any particular Sect whatever. He, speaking of *Cromwell*, says, “He was a Man of Prudence, Industry, and Ability, worthy of a better Master and a better Fate. Tho’ raised to the Summit of Power, from a very low Origin, he betrayed no Insolence, or Contempt of his Inferiors, and was careful to remember all the Obligations which, during his lower Fortune, he had owed to any one\*.”— Gratitude and Humility, Sir, surely are no Marks of a brutal Savageness of Temper.

I come now, Sir, to consider some Passages in the Life of your favourite Cardinal. In many Things he was undoubtedly wrong; particularly in his *pretended Embassy* to the Emperor and the King of *France*. I call it *pretended*, because I think no Subject of any Prince whatsoever can lawfully enter the Service of a foreign Prince, or appear in any public Character from him, without the Consent of his natural Sovereign, but is at any Time liable to be recalled home, and is guilty of *Treason* if he refuses to obey; and therefore *Pole* (more particularly as he entered into the Service of his Sovereign's *Enemy* the Pope) was justly outlawed and attainted; and for this Reason, *Henry's* Demand, that he should be delivered up by *Francis*, cannot be considered as a Violation of the Law of Nations. I call it too a *pretended Embassy* on another Account; for you tell us, That many Historians thought his Journey into *Flanders* only a Cloak to conceal his Design of fomenting the Rebellion at that Time raised against the King, and of usurping the Crown himself; it seems to me not to be a forced Consequence, from the Cardinal's own Account of it, as quoted by you, that he had concerted the former Part of this Scheme at least, and that he designed to avail

avail himself of those Troubles to effect his Return into *England*.

In the Letter which you have quoted, p. 183, he says, "I will not deny, but that "if Offices of Persuasion and Friendship "were of no Effect, I then advised them to "employ Threats, and to break off all Inter- "course and Communication with him: "Nor had I Recourse to this last Expe- "dient, till his Case was almost desperate, "and then I applied it with the utmost Ha- "zard of my own Life." Conscious, I sup- pose, that *Henry* would use all possible Means to get into his Power a Person who deserved to die as a Traitor to his King and Country, which this Letter proves him; for in it he confesses that he had endeavoured to excite the Emperor and *Francis* against his Sovereign. In your 191st Page, you tell us, "That the Legate being arrived at *Placentia*, "informed *Contareni*, that since the Person, "who was employed to bring him Intelli- "gence, had left *England*, he had heard no- "thing of the Meeting in the North, on "which, says he, every Thing depends." Here we have, *confessedly*, all his Hopes cen- tered in a Rebellion. A little further on, he laments to *Contareni* the Trouble and Dan- ger of the Enterprize in which he is enga- ged.

ged. The rest of this Letter, you tell us, is wanting, and that we have Reason to regret the Loss of it. I think so too, Sir; for if you will allow me to conjecture as well as yourself, it would probably have given us a perfect Insight into all the Cardinal's Schemes with regard to *England*. Not long after you tell us, " That at *Lyons* he receiv'd the News " of the Defeat of the Insurgents, in which " the Leaders had been taken Prisoners and " put to Death [p. 192]; and that this un- " expected Turn of Affairs disconcerted all " the Legate's Measures with respect to *Eng-* " *land.*" [p. 193.]

Here again, by the Suppression of the Rebellion, we find all his Measures frustrated. Can any one, Sir, desire a plainer Proof than this, that his Intention in coming into *Flanders* was to take Advantage of the Confusion occasioned by those Insurrections, had they not been providentially disappointed? But, lest this Proof should not be deemed sufficient, you have been kind enough to furnish us with another, which, in my Opinion, is still stronger. In the Cardinal's Letter to the Pope, in which he gives the Reasons for his speedy Return to *Rome*, and likewise for his longer Continuance in *Flanders*, " The " Cause, says he, for which I undertook this  
 " Jour-

" Journey, is now become so desperate, as  
 " not to deserve the least Risque should be  
 " run for it; nor can your Holiness be taxed  
 " with Inconsiderateness in undertaking, or  
 " with Levity in laying it aside, since the  
 " Difference of Circumstances justifies both  
 " Proceedings. These Measures were con-  
 " cerned when the People of *England* were  
 " in Arms, and had Men of Birth and Abi-  
 " lity to head them, and the Cause, on the  
 " whole, promised Success. That the *En-*  
 " *glish* Ministry were under these Apprehen-  
 " sions is apparent from the Efforts they  
 " made to hinder me from a nearer Ap-  
 " proach; but now the Insurrection is quel-  
 " led, and the Leaders put to Death. If  
 " any Hopes yet remain, some Degree of  
 " Security is necessary to the Person who is  
 " to revive them; which is so far from being  
 " the Case, that I see nothing but Danger  
 " from all Parts, and therefore the Censure  
 " will fall, not on *my being recalled*, but con-  
 " tinuing where I am. This Consideration  
 " has still more Weight, as I seem to be the  
 " only Minister who can be charged with  
 " such a Negotiation; and tho' that which I  
 " am now engaged in has proved unsucces-  
 " ful, yet his Holiness's Forecast would be  
 " acknowledged in sending me *at such a*  
 " *Juncture*, to a People disposed as the *En-*

" *glish*

" *glisb then* seemed to be ; tho' his Vigilance  
 " and Sagacity could not command Events,  
 " which were not in Man's Disposal, but in  
 " the good Pleasure of the Almighty" [p. 198  
 and 199.] (May we ever acknowledge, as  
 we ought, with Hearts full of Gratitude,  
 the Goodness of Providence in defeating the  
 Designs of the Pope and Cardinal.) But to  
 return to the Reasons the Cardinal assigns  
 for his longer Stay. He says " That the Zeal  
 " of all Well-wishers to the common Cause  
 " of Christianity should be answerable to the  
 " Obstinacy of those who strive to pervert  
 " her received Doctrines, and rend for ever so  
 " fair a Portion from the Communion of the  
 " Catholic Church ; nor did it appear how  
 " this Zeal could be more effectually exerted,  
 " than by placing in their Sight one of their  
 " own Nation, whose Reputation had always  
 " been unblemished, and his religious Princi-  
 " ples pure and unchanged ; whose Example  
 " and Authority might have an Influence on  
 " them, before the Remembrance of the Paths  
 " they had forsaken was quite obliterated,  
 " and all further Concern about them laid  
 " aside ; and be such a one as to shew more  
 " by Deeds than Speeches, that no Dangers  
 " were capable of intimidating him, when  
 " the Welfare of his Country was at Stake.  
 " That the natural Effect of the King's late  
 " Pro-

“ Proceedings was to exasperate the Minds  
 “ of the People, and instruct them in greater  
 “ Caution, as the Insurrection had been ap-  
 “ peased, first, by fair Words and Promises,  
 “ by which the Leaders were deceived, and  
 “ then put to Death ; but that the same  
 “ Wrongs still subsisted, and the same Incli-  
 “ nation to redress them ; *and if they had any*  
 “ *Hopes in a Chief*, Opportunities of assert-  
 “ ing their Rights could never be wanting in  
 “ the present Ferment. This Prospect indeed  
 “ might be distant, but ought still to be kept  
 “ in View, and there was no Forbearance but  
 “ should be submitted to when such a Point  
 “ was to be gained” [p. 199, 200].

Let any one read this Letter over calmly and dispassionately, not considering it as the Letter of Cardinal *Pole*, but of any other Person, with Regard to any other Government, and then let him hesitate, if he can, to pronounce the Author guilty of Treason, intending to excite Rebellion, and to place himself as a *Chief* at the Head of the Malecontents. This, Sir, (admitting it to be a Fact, that *Henry* did set a Price on *Pole's* Head, as you term it) may be sufficient to justify him ; he only offered a Reward for securing a Traitor and a Rebel ; for it is very observable that, in all the Places where you

mention the intended Assassination of the Cardinal, you quote no Authority for it but the Cardinal's Letters, and his Life, I suppose that wrote by *Beccatelli*: You never tell us the Name of the *Englishman* who came to him at *Liege*, and who decamped with so much Precipitation the next Morning, [see p. 202]. You likewise conceal the Names of three *Italians* at *Viterbo*, and the two *Englishmen* and the *Italian* at *Capranica*, [p. 306]. I suppose, least, if you had given us any Names, by this Means the Facts might have come to have been controverted; for you will excuse me if I think that, could it have been clearly proved, it would have been Matter of too great Triumph to you not to have been set forth at full Length with all it's Authorites; and it is extremely remarkable, that such an Affair should have escaped the Notice of most of our Historians, (at least all I have seen make no Mention of it) and be reserved for Mr. *Phillips*'s Discovery. Speaking of the Instructions given to him on his Embassy to the Emperor and the King of *France*, after the Congress at *Nice*, you say, That as these Instructions have a hostile Air with respect to *Henry*, it may seem extraordinary the Legate should take upon him such a Commission, [p. 242]. Not in the least extraordinary, Sir, that he should persist in his former Conduct,

and

and that a Traitor should continue to commit Treason.

I shall not enter into a long Detail of the Quarrel between *Henry II.* and *Becket*, tho' I cannot wholly pass it over in Silence, as it affords us so manifest a Proof of your Injustice and Partiality, in so highly extolling the Prelate and depreciating the Monarch.

The Sanctity of the ~~former~~ was so much doubted, even in that Age, that *Rapin* tells us, it was the Subject of a public Dispute at *Paris*, about Fifty Years after his Death, whether he was in Heaven or in Hell <sup>†</sup>. Now, Sir, tho' you, by the Character you give him, and the Appellation of Saint with which you honour him, seem clearly of Opinion that he is in Heaven, I will leave this Dispute undecided, as I think it is presumptuous to determine absolutely concerning the future and eternal Condition of any one; and with respect to his Merits here upon Earth, (tho' I would not be understood to vindicate the *Manner* in which he lost his Life) yet I think he certainly deserv'd to die, by the Sentence of the Law, for Treason and Rebellion; and I make no Doubt but you yourself would pronounce the same Sentence, if you was to read the same Facts concerning the Grand Signor

and the Mufti of Constantinople. With respect to the Monarch, you tell us, "That, at his Accession, the whole Nation was in the utmost Consternation lest he should avail himself of the Title of Conquest; and set aside the Rights of the People, in Imitation of the Founder of the *Norman Line*" [p. 229.]

Rapin tells us, "It was with extreme Satisfaction the English beheld on the Throne a Prince descended, by his Mother, from their antient Kings, and who gave the Crown a brighter Lustre than ever." You say further, "That the King was of a violent and assuming Spirit, as the whole Tenor of his Life shews, and the English had every Thing to apprehend from the Effects of it. This Temper hurried him into frequent Frenzies, of which History has recorded strange Instances" [p. 229]. I have read over his Reign again both in Rapin and Hume, and am at a Loss to discover this; the latter of these Authors says of him, "That he was the greatest Prince of his Time for Wisdom, Virtue, and Ability; that his Character, both in public and private Life, is almost without a Blemish, and he seems to have possessed every Accomplishment, both of Body and Mind, which makes a Man either estimable or amiable,"\* How blind

longe distiQ odia patet nos etiam tunc  
then

then must have been that Zeal, how strange that Partiality, which has led you so to misrepresent him? The Truth is, he opposed the Usurpations of the Church; but I doubt not that the Noble Lord, from whom the Public have long expected his Life, whose liberal Turn of Mind is so well known, will do his Memory ample Justice, and fully vindicate him from your bigotted Aspersions. I cannot wholly take Leave of this Subject, without some Notice of the Passage you have quoted from *Montesquieu*: The former Part of it must be allowed to be a little in Favour of your Sentiments; but had you attended to the latter, I think you would never have quoted it: "This Barrier, says he, *viz.* the "Power of the Clergy, is always useful, "when others are wanting; for as Despotism "causes the greatest Ills to Human Nature, "an Evil itself which controuls it, becomes "a Blessing." You see, Sir, his Opinion of the Power of the Clergy is, That it is an Evil in itself, only tolerable as a Counterbalance to Despotism, and I think he might have justly called it a worse Evil than Despotism itself, since it forges Chains for the Mind as well as the Body; and I believe there never was an Age, since the first Birth of Arts and Sciences, and the first Dawnings of Philosophy, of such gross Ignorance and Barbarism, as that in which

which Ecclesiastical Power prevailed the most.

I much admire your Art and Address in softening and apologizing for the Encroachments of Papal Power, [p. 238, 239, and 240]. You tell us, "That their Authority of deposing Kings, and giving away Kingdoms, is no Part of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, that no Professor would be allowed to maintain it in those Countries which are most attached to her Communion, and no Book suffered to appear in Public where it was asserted." I believe it is not now Part of their *avowed* Doctrine, since they well know how useless and insignificant it would be: But yet I doubt not, if it was possible, they would revive both the Doctrine and the Power in it's full Extent; and tho' no Book might be suffered to appear in *Catholic* Countries, which had a Tendency to establish the Pope's Supremacy; yet, in a *Protestant* Country, and by an *Englishman*, we have lately seen a Book containing whole Pages in Vindication of it, and Censures of *Henry VIII.* for revolting from it, *viz.* Mr. *Phillips's* Life of *Cardinal Pole.*

It

It seems surprizing to me, that you should have recorded two such Instances of Superstition, as you have done in your favourite Cardinal and his Friend *Bembo*; the former, in his Return to *Italy*, visits the *fictitious* Retreat of *Mary Magdalene*; there he pours forth his Prayers for the declared Enemy of his GOD and himself (as he has before stiled *Henry VIII.*); but tells us, "He felt not the inward Comfort he desired as a Pledge of his Request being granted; but rather seem'd to hear a Voice which increased his Affliction, and was the same which said to the Prophet, who was likewise supplicating for his Sovereign, *Why dost thou lament a Person whom I have cast off?* \* [p. 273]. Alas, poor *Henry*, thou hadst revolted from the Church, and even the Prayers of St. *Reginald* could avail thee nothing.

Proceed we now to Cardinal *Bembo*. "The Pope design'd to create him a Cardinal; his Modesty was on the Point of refusing it; but going to Church, the Morning after he received the News, in order to ask a superior Direction in the Step he was to take, as he approached the Altar, the Priest being come to those Words of JESUS CHRIST to St. Peter, (which Name *Bembo* bore) *Peter, follow me*, he took them as

" ad-

" address'd to himself, and no longer opposed  
 " a Dignity which he had not sought, and  
 " now interpreted it as the Will of Heaven he  
 " shou'd accept" [p. 279]. A very fortunate  
 Circumstance this, that he should come in-  
 to Church just at that Time: Now, suppos-  
 ing he had unluckily enter'd at that Verse,  
 " The Lord turned and said unto *Peter*, get  
 " thee behind me, *Satan*, for thou art an Of-  
 " fence unto me," I am of Opinion he  
 would have forgot his Name of *Peter*; or, if  
 he had observ'd the Name, would have prayed  
 for further Direction, and *have seem'd to hear*  
*a Voice*, that he was not the *Peter* to whom  
 the Rebuke was addressed.

I could wish, Sir, for the Sake of the Cardinal, you had omitted the Comparison be-  
 tween his Behaviour on the Death of his Mo-  
 ther, and that of *Tully* on the Death of his  
 Daughter, [p. 314, 315] as I by no Means  
 think it redounds so greatly to his Honour as  
 you would insinuate. *Tully's* Concern for  
 the Death of his Daughter was certainly very  
 violent, and perhaps expressed with much  
 more Strength of Passion than the Cardinal's  
 Grief for the Loss of his Mother; but, other-  
 wise, their Behaviour seems exactly the same,  
 only that *Tully* had no Opportunity of being  
 better informed, the Cardinal either did or  
 should

should have known better ; *Tully* enrolls his Daughter among the Tutelar Deities of *Rome* ; the Cardinal advances his Mother to be a Saint in Heaven ; “ I am now, says he, “ the Son of a Martyr ” [p. 313]. And on his Secretary’s being struck with Horror at the Relation of her Death, “ Be of good Courage, says the Cardinal, we have now “ one Patron more added to those we already “ had in Heaven ” [p. 314]. Is it possible to produce two Instances of Behaviour more exactly parallel ?

In your 319th Page you speak of the Corruptions of the Church in the twelfth Century, and you tell us, “ The Disorders had “ since increased, and a celebrated Prelate of “ the following Age being ordered by the “ Pope to prepart the Matters, which were “ to be discussed in the Council of *Vienna*, “ makes the Reformation of the Church, in “ its Head and Members, the Ground-work “ of this Undertaking : ” And, p. 320, you tell us, “ That not one of these great Men, who “ so earnestly desired the Reformation of the “ Church, ever entertained a Thought of “ changing a fingle Article of her Faith, or “ abolishing any Part of her Worship.” I am sorry for it with all my Heart, for let any one read the History of those Times, and he

will find the Tenets as absurd and as impious as their Conduct was loose and abandoned: And indeed how should it be otherwise; for, as our Saviour says, *A corrupt Tree cannot bring forth good Fruit*; no more can sound Doctrine spring from vicious Morals, than the Stream can be wholesome which flows from a poisoned Fountain: And indeed they mutually operate upon each other; for when our Morals are depraved, we naturally search for Principles which will make us easy with our Vices; and when we have found any, which we think will answer the Purpose, they lull the Mind into a thoughtless Security, and we give ourselves up, without Remorse, to the Indulgence of our Passions.

The further I read, the more excellent Entertainment, Sir, do you afford me; you tell us, *p. 322*, “That, to the Disadvantages under which Christianity then laboured, the fifteenth Century had likewise the Misfortune to see most of the Popes, during that Period, *altogether unworthy* the supreme Place they held, and their Court, instead of giving that Example which the World had a Right to expect from it, was infected with Vices, which, like a Torrent, spread themselves over all Nations.” What, Sir, the *infallible* Successors of St. Peter, the Vicars

Vicars of JESUS CHRIST, most of them, during a whole Century, *unworthy* of their supreme Places ! their Court infected with Vices ! Pray, Sir, tell me what became in the mean Time of their Holinesses Infallibility ; for I think you will not deny Vice to be Error, and if they erred so much in Practice, I doubt at the same Time they made some *few slight Deviations* from the Truth, in Points of Faith and Doctrine. By allowing, therefore, their Viciousness of Conduct, you have yourself overthrown one main Pillar of your Church, their Infallibility, and thus betrayed the Cause you laboured so *strenuously* to support.

You seem highly to ridicule the Declaration of the Synod of *Scrinia*, that every one should be allowed to believe as he thought proper ; but if you will give yourself a Moment's Time to consider, you will not, perhaps, think it so very wild a Resolution as you are pleased to call it ; for it is really allowing no more than what they could not possibly prevent ; for tho' Racks, Gibbets, and Stakes may perhaps oblige a Man to disown his real Opinion, or pretend to believe what he is by no Means convinced of ; yet Faith, being an Act of the Mind, is not compellable by all the Tortures of the Inquisition.

Having already, at the Beginning of this Letter, taken Notice of the Excellence of some (among many others equally admirable) of the Decisions of the Council of *Trent*, your *compleat and accurate Rule of Faith*, I should wholly have passed over in Silence that Part of your Book, which relates to the History of that Council, had not some extraordinary Reflections of Mr. *Phillips*'s seemed to me worthy of some Observation. Having mentioned Cardinal *Pacheco*'s Proposal of prohibiting the Translation of the Scriptures into modern Languages, you tell us, " That the " prodigious Abuse of the Word of GOD, " and the Licentiousness with which every " one perverted it according to his own " Fancy, gave Occasion for this Motion; " and though you will not take upon you to " decide on either Side of the Question, yet " you will briefly propose what may be al- ledged to justify the Restraint. And, first, " in Times so distant from the Faith and " teachable Disposition of the primitive " Christians, it may perhaps not be expedi- " ent to put indifferently into the Hands of " all the World those sacred Oracles, of " which GOD has given the Understanding " to pure Souls, and which the Ignorant, ac- " cording to St. Peter, wrest to their own " Destruction. It may be further argued, " that

" that it is inherent to low Minds to under-  
 " value what they have always before their  
 " Eyes, and to reverence what is less obvi-  
 " ous: That the wisest Nations have always  
 " removed the Mysteries of Religion from  
 " the Approaches of the Vulgar; and JESUS  
 " CHRIST himself, who is the Wisdom of  
 " GOD, had so often spoke in Parables, to  
 " conceal from gross Understandings what  
 " he designed to reveal in particular to his  
 " Disciples: That in the Old and New Te-  
 " stament there are several Passages which  
 " require great Attention, Knowledge, and  
 " Sobriety of Thought, and which it were  
 " better to leave in the learned Languages;  
 " for otherwise they become a Means of Se-  
 " duction to carnal Men, who do not under-  
 " stand the Things that are of GOD; and to  
 " proud and presumptuous Spirits, who ima-  
 " gine they understand what they are igno-  
 " rant of" [p. 356, 357]. If the Abuse of  
 the Word of GOD, and the Perversion of it  
 from it's original Design, is a sufficient Rea-  
 son for debarring Men from the Use of it, I  
 think the first Persons who should be denied  
 that Privilege ought to be the Pope and the  
 College of Cardinals; for I am sure no Abuse  
 can be more palpable, no Perversion more  
 gross, than many Interpretations which they  
 have put upon it. As to your Objection,

That

That it is not expedient to put the Scriptures into the Hands of all Men, because *some have wrested them to their own Destruction*, it appears to me insufficient and inconclusive, for the following Reasons: First, since the same Argument would hold good against the Light of Reason, for there are many who pervert and abuse that excellent Gift in themselves, and endeavour to corrupt it in others, and they pervert it to their Destruction. Would you therefore have Men in general deprived of Reason, because it has been abused by some? Surely not. GOD has given us certain Faculties, which, rightly employed, will conduct us to Happiness; if perverted, will occasion our Misery. He has likewise vouchsafed us a written Revelation, which, if rightly attended to, *will make us wise unto Salvation*; if not duly observed as a Rule of Life, but only studied in Support of speculative Points, may endanger our Salvation: If therefore the Perversion of the one be a sufficient Cause of it's Removal, with equal Force may it be urged against the Corruption of the other. Another Reason why this Argument does not seem to me conclusive, is, That had the Apostle thought this the proper Method of proceeding, he would have given Directions for it, when he mentions this Misfortune of some having wrested the Scriptures to their own

own Destruction ; but he is quite silent upon that Subject, leaves them entirely to their former Liberty, and only admonishes them to beware of falling into the same Errors. Your Argument, That it is inherent in low Minds to undervalue what they have always before their Eyes, you must yourself allow to be fallacious ; for otherwise what is it preserves their Veneration for your Images, which are the daily Objects of their Adoration ? I presume therefore the same Arts of Persuasion which are sufficient to maintain their Veneration for the one, would be sufficient to preserve their Respect for the other. But further, Sir, you tell us, That the wisest Nations have always removed the Mysteries of Religion from the Approaches of the Vulgar. By a Man who professes himself a Christian, I was surprized to find this Argument alledged ; for since we allow of only two divine Revelations, it is from the Practice of *their* Professors, and not from those of false Religions, that we ought to argue. As for the *Mysteries* of Religion being removed from the Approaches of the Vulgar, it seems to me impossible but they must be always concealed, not only from the Vulgar, but from the most learned and refined Understandings ; for by a Mystery I understand a Truth immediately revealed by GOD, which is above the

Com-

That it is not expedient to put the Scriptures into the Hands of all Men, because *some have wrested them to their own Destruction*, it appears to me insufficient and inconclusive, for the following Reasons: First, since the same Argument would hold good against the Light of Reason, for there are many who pervert and abuse that excellent Gift in themselves, and endeavour to corrupt it in others, and they pervert it to their Destruction. Would you therefore have Men in general deprived of Reason, because it has been abused by some? Surely not. GOD has given us certain Faculties, which, rightly employed, will conduct us to Happiness; if perverted, will occasion our Misery. He has likewise vouchsafed us a written Revelation, which, if rightly attended to, *will make us wise unto Salvation*; if not duly observed as a Rule of Life, but only studied in Support of speculative Points, may endanger our Salvation: If therefore the Perversion of the one be a sufficient Cause of it's Removal, with equal Force may it be urged against the Corruption of the other. Another Reason why this Argument does not seem to me conclusive, is, That had the Apostle thought this the proper Method of proceeding, he would have given Directions for it, when he mentions this Misfortune of some having wrested the Scriptures to their own

own Destruction; but he is quite silent upon that Subject, leaves them entirely to their former Liberty, and only admonishes them to beware of falling into the same Errors. Your Argument, That it is inherent in low Minds to undervalue what they have always before their Eyes, you must yourself allow to be fallacious; for otherwise what is it preserves their Veneration for your Images, which are the daily Objects of their Adoration? I presume therefore the same Arts of Persuasion which are sufficient to maintain their Veneration for the one, would be sufficient to preserve their Respect for the other. But further, Sir, you tell us, That the wisest Nations have always removed the Mysteries of Religion from the Approaches of the Vulgar. By a Man who professes himself a Christian, I was surprized to find this Argument alledged; for since we allow of only two divine Revelations, it is from the Practice of *their* Professors, and not from those of false Religions, that we ought to argue. As for the *Mysteries* of Religion being removed from the Approaches of the Vulgar, it seems to me impossible but they must be always concealed, not only from the Vulgar, but from the most learned and refined Understandings; for by a Mystery I understand a Truth immediately revealed by GOD, which is above the

Com-

Comprehension of human Reason, and therefore is not an Object of the Understanding, but of Faith; for if you can understand them, you can explain them; if you can explain them, at once they cease to be Mysteries. There are several Passages, you say, in the Old and New Testament, which require great Attention, Knowledge, and Sobriety of Thought, and which it were better to leave in the learned Languages; for otherwise they become a Means of Seduction to carnal Men. To this, Sir, I answer, That the Practice of the Authors both of the Old and New Testament is against you, for they wrote in the vulgar and popular Language of the Persons to whom they addressed themselves; and that there are many Texts in the Old and New Testament, which expressly contradict the Doctrine you would endeavour to establish. For Instance; in the 6th Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, 6th and following Verses; and still more particularly in the 27th Chapter, 2d and 3d Verses, "It shall be on the Day when you shall pass over *Jordan* unto the Land which the LORD thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great Stones, and plaister them with Plaister, and thou shalt write upon them *all* the Words of this Law." And not contented with this Order, he repeats it in

in the 8th Verse, and says, "Thou shalt  
 " write upon the Stones *all* the Words of this  
 " Law very plainly." Observe, Sir, there is  
 no Exception, *all* is to be wrote, and that too  
 plainly, that every one might read. And, in  
 the New Testament, St. Paul, in his Epistle  
 to the *Romans*, 15th Chapter and 4th Verse,  
 says, "*Whatsoever Things* were written afore-  
 " time, were written for our Learning, that  
 " we, through Patience and Comfort of the  
 " Scriptures, might have Hope." And  
 again, in his second Epistle to *Timothy*, the  
 3d Chapter and the 16th Verse, he says,  
 " All Scripture is given by Inspiration of  
 " GOD, and is profitable for Doctrine, for  
 " Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in  
 " Righteousness." Here again, Sir, you will  
 be pleased to observe, there is no Exception  
 of doubtful or difficult Passages, nor any Ad-  
 vice nor Injunction for the Suppression of  
 them; nor do I find any in the other Parts  
 of Scripture; and the Conclusion which I  
 would draw from hence is, That the Reading  
 of all Scripture ought to be allowed.

Your whole Panegyric on the Council of  
 Trent, [p. 422, &c.] at the Conclusion of  
 your Account of their Decrees, is too long for  
 a Quotation, otherwise I would have present-  
 ed it to the Reader; I shall only say therefore,

in regard to it, that I am sorry so excellent a Pen was not employed in a better Cause; for if ever there were Decrees contradictory to Scripture, Reason, and common Sense, they are to be found in the Canons of that Council. Some of them, it must be acknowledged, are really excellent; particularly the Canons against Non-residence, Pluralities, and Neglect of Duty in the Bishops and inferior Clergy; and I hope I shall not be accused of being favourable to Popery, when I wish that these Canons, or *something similar* to them, were adopted, and *strictly adhered to*, in our Church.

As this Letter has already been insensibly extended beyond what I first design'd, I shall be as short as the Circumstances will permit me in my Observations on the second Part of your History, which I am now entering upon. The first Thing which I shall take Notice of is the Cardinal's Letter to Queen *Mary* on her Accession, and on his being appointed Legate; and here I shall only observe to what a Height he carries the Authority of the Pope or the Church; for as his Expression in the *first* Passage I shall quote is something *equivocal*, I shall not take upon me to decide which he means: He tells us, " That " Integrity and Religion had both been ba-  
" nished,

“ nished, when the Obedience due to the Au-  
 “ thority established by JESUS CHRIST was  
 “ laid aside; nor would be restored but with  
 “ it” [2d Part, p. 5]. Here is a *Divine*  
*Authority* asserted for either Pope or Church,  
 and is equally true of either. A little further  
 he says, “ That he had ever known the  
 “ Queen most grateful to GOD for his Mer-  
 “ cies, and most observant of his Laws, at  
 “ the Head of which was the Acknowledgment  
 “ of the Church’s Authority” [p. 6]. Here,  
 “ Sir, is filial Obedience without Measure,  
 and paternal or maternal Authority, apply it  
 to Pope or Church which you will, exalted  
 above every Duty, moral, social, or religious.  
 If he is not already enrolled in the Calendar  
 of Saints, I hope some future Pope will have  
 Gratitude sufficient to gratify one who seems  
 to have deserved little less of the Holy See  
 than *Thomas à Becket*.

You tell us, Sir, “ That the Houses declare  
 “ the Validity of the Marriage between *Hen-*  
 “ *ry* and *Catherine of Arragon*, and repeal  
 “ whatever had been enacted on a contrary  
 “ Supposition; they express their highest Dis-  
 “ approbation of *Cranmer’s Behaviour* in that  
 “ Proceeding, of which, indeed, they give many  
 “ shameful Instances” [p. 18]. That an Act  
 of Parliament to declare the Queen’s Legiti-

macy should disapprove of *Cranmer's* Proceedings in her Mother's Divorce, is not at all surprizing ; but I wished much to see what *shameful Instances* they could produce of *Cranmer's* Conduct in that Affair, and for that Purpose searched two or three Editions of the Statutes at large ; and, to my no small Mortification, could only find the Title of the Statute you refer to ; I should be glad, therefore, if you would inform me where you got a Sight of these Reflections upon *Cranmer*, or whether they are only the Offspring of your own Imagination.

I should have taken no further Notice of the Pope's Supremacy, having in the former Part of this Letter, as I think, sufficiently disproved his Title to it ; but as *Queen Mary*, in one of her Letters to the Cardinal, has treated of this Subject, and the Cardinal, in his Answer, has approved of her Reasoning as conclusive, I could not pay so little Respect to these illustrious Personages as not to make a few Observations upon their Arguments. She tells the Cardinal, " That the  
 " Title in Debate does not agree with Kings,  
 " as the Royal State in Spiritual Concerns is  
 " subordinate to the Sacerdotal ; and the Ju-  
 " risdiction of the Body Politic being of a  
 " different Order from that of the Priesthood,  
 " their

" their Power, Dignity, and Functions, were  
 " distinct" [p. 19]. The Cardinal, in his  
 Answer, tells her, " That she had reasoned  
 " very well on the distinct Jurisdiction of the  
 " Kingly Office and the Priesthood, and had  
 " rightly concluded the Incongruity of her  
 " own Sex for the latter; he should therefore  
 " only add to what she had remark'd, that if  
 " the great Apostle forbids a Woman to  
 " teach in the Church, how absurd and ini-  
 " quitous must it be to attribute to any one  
 " of that Sex the Quality of Supreme Head  
 " of it? If a Woman, according to the same  
 " great Instructor of the Christian World,  
 " cannot be said to be the Head of one Man,  
 " to whom she is joined in Marriage, because  
 " the Law of Nature has instituted Society  
 " on a different Plan, both Human and Di-  
 " vine Institutions forbid she should be the  
 " Head of that numerous Multitude which  
 " compose a national Church; that therefore  
 " she must resign the Supremacy to that  
 " Power, in which GOD had invested it."

" [p. 23]. Having set before the Reader,  
 Sir, these Arguments, let us now examine  
 their Validity, and I flatter myself with being  
 able to shew that they are by no Means con-  
 clusive: To begin with her Majesty's, The  
 Title in Debate, &c. I believe there is no  
 Instance before the *Roman* Pontiffs Af-  
 sumption

sumption of their Power in which the Independence, much less the Superiority, of the Ecclesiastical Power over the Civil was ever asserted, at least I never heard or read of any, tho' I could produce Numbers in which the Superiority of the latter was asserted, and the Subordination of the former acknowledged; and many in which the Power and Dignity, so far from being consider'd as distinct, have been united in the same Person: How often among the *Romans* did the Dictators and Emperors enjoy the Office of *Pontifex Maximus*? Among the *Jews* latterly the same Person was very frequently King and High Priest, and *Melchizedech*, King of *Salem*, was also Priest of the Most High GOD. Here, Sir, I will rest it, for I think there can want no additional Proof of the Union of the two Powers which her Majesty contends so much for keeping distinct. To come now to the Cardinal, " If a Woman, he says, according to St. *Paul*, cannot be said to be the Head of one Man, to whom she is joined in Marriage, because the Law of Nature has instituted Society on a different Plan, both Human and Divine Institutions forbid she should be the Head of that numerous Multitude which compose a National Church." Excellent Reasoner! An admirable Specimen this of the Manner in which

which the Cardinal applies Scripture ! Pray, Sir, as I cannot apply to the Cardinal himself, will you be so kind as to answer me a Question or two ; By what Authority did the Queen so invert the Laws of Nature as to exercise Civil Jurisdiction over her Lay Subjects ? for I am sure this Text is full as strong against her Civil as her Ecclesiastical Power : Or, were all her Lay Subjects Women, and so she might exercise Authority over them ? Tho' the Body of the Clergy was pretty numerous, yet I suppose the Number of Laymen greatly exceeded them ; then how strange was it for her to bear Rule over so many Men ?

“ Several, you say, both of the Secular and “ Regular Clergy, had entered on a Marriage “ State, which the Example of the Apostles, “ the antient Usage of the whole Western “ Church, the Councils and Canons, had “ made unlawful to the former ; and besides “ the Obligation arising from these Heads, “ the most solemn Engagements had ren- “ dered utterly inconsistent with the Pro- “ fession of the latter” [p. 58]. Now, Sir, as I have not any History of the Apostles at present by me, I will not take upon me peremptorily to say how many of them were married, but I think I have somewhere read that

that several of them were; but however of this I am very certain that your own great Bishop St. Peter was married, as our Saviour work'd a Miracle for the Relief of his Wife's Mother; and tho' I own St. Paul, in some Places of his Epistles, seems to give the Preference to a single State, yet I cannot help believing that he meant it only as his Advice to the first Converts to Christianity, who, it was highly probable, would be called upon to suffer Persecution and Martyrdom in the Cause of CHRIST; and that he never intended it as a particular Restraint to those who were to preach the Gospel, any more than others, is, I think, very plain from his giving Directions in his Epistle to *Timothy* concerning *Bishops and Deacons, and their Wives.* That it was not the antient Usage of the whole Western Church, at least not from the Apostles Time, is very clear from this Circumstance, That St. *Gregory's Father* was *Grandson*, (as *Dupin* says) to *Pope Fælix the Second*, therefore his Holiness was either married or worse\*. And as it was at the very latter End of the sixth Century that St. *Gregory* flourished, it may be supposed his Great Grandfather might reign about the latter End of the fifth Century, therefore it was a long Time before *Celibacy* was established, for

I will not suppose the Pope would take a Liberty he denied to others. As you seem to think some Things above the Reach of the Legislature, and that they should have considered whether an Act of Parliament could unconsecrate Churches, so I think there are some Things above the Authority of even Councils and Canons; in which Number the Celibacy of so numerous a Body of Men and Women as are professed in the *Romish* Church, seems to me certainly included, since on many Accounts it is criminal. It is wrong with regard to their own Families, which, by this Means, they suffer to be extinguished: It is injurious to the Public, which thereby loses Numbers of useful Subjects: And it is a Violation of the Law of Nature implanted in them.

When the Legate arrived at *Calais*, we are told, an Incident happened, which was remarked by every one there present, and interpreted as a *Declaration of Heaven in his Favour*; and which, in whatever Light it may now be looked on by the Reader, you must not omit. The Wind, which for several Days had been so contrary as to make the Passage to *England* impracticable, and seemed as if it would continue so, on the very Night of the Legate's Arrival, became

“ became on a sudden fair, and in a few Hours conveyed him and his Retinue to Dover” [p. 77]. Now, Sir, admitting the Fact, (though, by the by, having looked into three different Histories of *England*, I find it mentioned in none of them, only in Mr. *Phillips's* Life of Cardinal *Pole*); but admitting, I say, the Fact, is it so very extraordinary, that, after the Wind had been several Days in one Quarter, it should change to another, that it must immediately be interpreted as a Declaration of Heaven in his Favour? I think not; nor would I advise you to contend for it very strongly, lest some Protestant should ask you, Whether you think Heaven indiscriminately favours both Friends and Foes; or whether you think a still more extraordinary Blessing of the same Kind would be vouchsafed to *wicked Heretics* for the Destruction of good *Catholics*: And yet so History tells us, That when *Blake* destroyed the *Spanish* Galleons in the Bay of *Santa-Cruz*, as soon as he came the Length of the *Canaries*, the Wind stood fair for him to enter the Bay, continued so till he had done his Business, and then changed and brought him safe out again. No sooner does the Legate arrive at Court, but Heaven makes a new Declaration in his Favour, and a most extraordinary one it is, unparalleled I believe

in  
embrace

in either antient or modern History; and what is it? His Instructions arrived from *Rome*, at a Time when they might reasonably be expected [p. 80]. I send an Agent to *London*, and his Instructions not being finally settled before he begins his Journey, I send them after him as soon as I conveniently can, that he may lose no Time; and the Messenger arrives safe with them soon after my Agent gets there: *O wonderful and astonishing Declaration of Heaven in my Favour!* But pray, Sir, if these Things were generally looked upon as Declarations of Heaven in Favour of the Cause, How comes the *pious Cardinal* not to appoint a general *Thanksgiving* on the Occasion?

The Cardinal's Speech to the Parliament is too extraordinary to be wholly neglected: He tells them, after thanking them for repealing his Attander, " That this Favour of theirs was the more welcome, as " it now furnished him with an Opportunity " of repaying it in a Matter of still greater " Importance to his Benefactors: That he " had been restored by them to the Place of " his Birth, and to a Nobility which could " boast no higher Origin than the Earth; " but he was come to inscribe them Denizens of a Heavenly Country, and reinstate

"them in that true and Christian Greatness,  
 "which they had forfeited by renouncing a  
 "Fealty, to which it had pleased Almighty  
 "GOD it should be annexed" [p. 81]. No  
 other possible Method of being made Deni-  
 zens of Heaven, but by acknowledging the  
 Pope's Supremacy; if this be not preaching  
 another Gospel than what CHRIST and his  
 Apostles taught, I wish Somebody would  
 inform me what is; for I am sure it is an-  
 nexing the Sanctions of the Gospel to *what*  
*they* never were intended to be applied to by  
 our Saviour or his Disciples.

Could no other Instance be given, yet I  
 think, Sir, that you have *in yourself* afforded  
 us not only a strong Presumption, but an  
 absolute Proof, "That what is called Pope-  
 "ry has the same Power over the Minds of  
 "Men, as *Circe's* Wand had over the Com-  
 "panions of *Ulysses*, to deprive them of their  
 "Reason" [p. 158]; otherwise you never  
 could have palliated the Crimes of *Gardiner*  
 in so artful a Manner, and inveighed with  
 so much Virulence, and dwelt with such  
 malicious Pleasure on every Failing in *Cran-  
 mer's* Conduct. Had you reversed the Char-  
 acters you have given them, perhaps you  
 would have come nearer the Truth: That  
*Cranmer* had many Failings, and some Faults  
 which

which cannot be excused, is what every impartial Protestant will readily admit, whatever some Persons, animated with an ardent Zeal in Behalf of any one who favoured their own Tenets, may, perhaps, assert ; yet, I believe, the Generality will allow, that *Cranmer* was highly blameable in prevaricating, with regard to the Oath concerning the Pope's Supremacy ; for certainly no Protestant against the Legality of it can discharge a Person from an Obligation entered into by an Oath ; therefore he ought not to have taken it at all ; nor is his Punishment of *Joan Bocher* and *George Van Par* at all defensible : With respect to his Submission to *Henry*'s arbitrary Will, in retaining most of the *Romish* Rites and Tenets, had he acted otherwise, he would not only have lost his own Life, but, in all Probability, have entirely ruined the glorious Cause, of which he was one great Defender and Support ; nay, had he possessed the absolute Power of *Henry* himself, he could not at once have introduced a thorough Reformation from those great Corruptions and Abuses which had crept into the Church. As to his subscribing the six Articles, you will allow me to doubt the Truth of the Assertion, till you produce some better Authority for it than merely *your own* ; for *Hume*, *Burnet*, *Rapin*,

and

and the *Parliamentary History*, all concur in saying that he opposed them with all his Power, and so strenuously, that when *Henry* wished him to withdraw the Day they were voted for, he refused, stayed, and voted against them; and as none of these Authors ever mention his being called upon to sign them, I think we may assert, in Contradiction to Mr. *Phillips*, That he never did subscribe them. His Abjuration of the Tenets he had professed, was owing to a too great Fondness for Life; Blame-worthy, certainly, when considered seriously, and free from those Emotions which the Dread of Death and Desire of Life excite in us; but yet it is a Weakness which, I think, no Man can treat severely, unless he who, having been placed in the same Circumstances, has acted with undaunted Fortitude and unshaken Constancy; and, surely, the heroic Firmness, the Christian Patience, with which he afterwards suffered, was an ample Atonement for this short Deviation to Error and Falshood. To conclude this Article, as Mr. *Hume* says,

“ He was *undoubtedly* a Man of Merit, pos-  
 “ sessed of Learning and Capacity, and adorn-  
 “ ed with Candor, Sincerity, and Beneficence,  
 “ and all those Virtues which were fitted to  
 “ render him useful and amiable in Society.”\*

With

\* 4th *Hume*, 46.

With respect to *Gardiner's* Character, I will take the Authority which you yourself produce, "He favoured the King's Divorce; " he maintained the King's Supremacy; and, "during *Henry's* Reign, his Pen had no other Direction than that Monarch's Capital thought fit to give it" [p. 120]. Or, in other Words, he prostituted his Conscience in every Thing the King imposed upon him; but these Things in him, *good Man*, were only *courtly Steps*. As to his being the chief Instigator of the cruel Persecutions under *Henry* and *Mary*, it is a Fact, I believe, almost universally allowed; even you have not ventured wholly to exculpate him from it, and it is a Stain which would sully the brightest Character, and will for ever render his Memory odious to every one who is a Friend to Religious Liberty; but what you say of *Burnet* is much more justly applicable to yourself, *You can bestow Praise or Obloquy just as it suits your Purpose*. Of this, Sir, you seem to have given a singular Instance in the Manner in which you have spoke of Bishop *Burnet* and his History of the Reformation, which appear so much the more extraordinary, as I thought it had been generally allowed a sensible and judicious Work, so far from being the Chaos which you would represent it; and in you, Sir, it

appears

appears not a little ungrateful to stigmatize, as you have done, an Historian who speaks so respectfully of your favourite Cardinal. That the Bishop was often too credulous, and admitted as Facts Things which were disputable, without examining so strictly as he ought to have done, is what Nobody can deny; but, Sir, had he published as many known Falshoods as Pages, yet even then he would hardly have deserved to have been treated with illiberal and low Abuse, and to have it said of him, *That he must have drank to the Dregs of that intoxicating Cup, with which the lying Prophets are drenched, to give out such Absurdities, and expect they should be credited* [p. 158.]

Blush therefore, and take Shame to yourself, Sir, for the Indecency with which you have treated a Writer, whose Credit in the particular Work we are now speaking of, is in almost every Instance supported by Vouchers publickly produced in the last Volume of that History; and whose strict and conscientious Behaviour in his Pastoral Office, will be ever an Example worthy the Imitation of all his Successors, and will for ever secure to him Respect and Veneration from All, except those whose Hearts reproach them for deviating from so bright a Pattern.

With

With what an Air of Triumph, Sir, do you tell us, That notwithstanding the many Provocations MARY, *that mild and gentle Queen*, met with, yet *two Years* passed without any Thing which had the Air of Persecution. Surely you have strangely forgot yourself, or else you think nothing but *Burning* is Persecution; for in the first Year of her Reign, 1553, all the Protestant Ministers were silenced; *Ridley*, Bishop of *London*; *Coverdale*, of *Exeter*; *Hooper*, of *Gloucester*; *Cranmer*, of *Canterbury*, were deprived and thrown into Prison; whither *Latimer*, Bishop of *Worcester*, in *Henry the Eighth's Time*, was also sent; and Judge *Hales*, by opposing these Measures, cancelled all his Merit of having strenuously defended her Title to the Crown; was sent to Prison, where the Severities he himself met with, and the still greater Cruelties he heard were preparing for the Reformed, deprived him of his Senses, and he put an End to his own Life \*.

Is all this no Persecution, Sir? And as to the Provocations you have heaped up together in p. 160, 161, it is well known that many of them happened in the Midst of her most violent Persecutions, particularly the intended Assassination you mention (which, by

the by, *Rapin* calls a pretended Conspiracy) : But granting the Truth of it, and that the Assassin justified the Fact, why should you lay so much Stress upon this Affair, and make such a Wonder of it, when Papists can afford us Instances by Dozens ? Witness *Clement, Ravillac, Babington, Fawkes, Damien*, and the late Attempts on the King of *Portugal*. But you have a happy Talent, Sir, at magnifying or diminishing, applauding or censuring, as your Prejudices direct you, as appears plainly from the Apology you have made for the cruel and furious Persecutions of *Mary's* Reign, and your Attempts to vindicate her from having had any Share in them.

Mr. *Hume* you have commended as *an impartial Historian* ; from him I will borrow her Character, and we shall find it almost in every Particular directly contrary to that which you have given us in p. 209. " She " possessed (says *Hume*) few Qualities either " estimable or amiable, and her Person was " as little engaging as her Behaviour and Ad- " dress. Obstinacy, Bigotry, Violence, Cru- " elty, Malignity, Revenge, Tyranny; every " Circumstance of her Character took a Tinc- " ture from her bad Temper and narrow Un- " derstanding ; and midst that Complication " of

“ of Vices which entered into her Composition, we shall scarce find any Virtue but Sincerity; a Quality which she seems to have maintained throughout her whole Life, except in the Beginning of her Reign, when the Necessity of her Affairs obliged her to make some Promises to the Protestants, which she certainly never intended to perform \*.”

And now, Sir, I will take my Leave of you and the Cardinal; only observing, that had you followed the Example of Moderation set you by your Hero, your Book might have been attended with more pernicious Consequences; but I think your earnest Zeal, and manifest Partiality, will, in the Opinion of sensible and judicious Persons, rather prejudice than advance your Cause. With respect to yourself, I am sorry to see one who calls himself an *Englishman*, a Native of that Country which is at present blest both with Civil and Religious Liberty, *should himself be so bigotted to a Religion* manifestly destructive of both, as to attempt to introduce it: Hitherto it has pleased the Almighty to defeat your secret Machinations and open Attempts for it's Restoration; may he continue to us his providential Care; may he inspire

those whose Duty it is to guard the People from Error with a becoming Zeal, tempered with a Spirit of true Christian Charity, which may animate them with an earnest Desire of recovering their perverted Flocks; and tho' we have not walked worthy of the Light vouchsafed to us, yet may He, of his infinite Mercy, be pleased still to continue it to us and our latest Posterity.



F I N I S.